

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-22 were presented for examination, and all claims were rejected. Claims 1, 12, and 17-20 are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-22 are presented for examination, of which claims 1, 12 and 17-20 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-22 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

I. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11 and 17-18 rejected over Roy, Almog and Balabine

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Roy et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0069080) (hereinafter “Roy”) in view of Almog et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0002479) (hereinafter “Almog”) and further in view of Balabine et al. (US 5,937,406) (hereinafter “Balabine”). Amended claims 1, 17 and 18 are independent. Claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Applicant traverses this rejection and submit that Roy, Almog and Balabine, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims as amended.

A. Amended Independent Claims 1, 17 and 18 Patentable over Roy, Almog and Balabine

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art references, either

alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims.

Amended claims 1, 17 and 18 recite in part:

permitting, within another instance of the interface of the computer-based management system, a second user to create, interactively with a recruitment specialist during a job description development process, a second job description based upon the first job description

Applicant submits that the combination of Roy, Almog and Balabine fails to teach or suggest at least the above feature of the claimed invention.

Neither Roy nor Almog nor Balabine teach or suggest a user creating interactively with a recruitment specialist during a job description development process a second job description based upon a first job description. None of these references describe a job description development process that is interactive between users, such as a client and a recruitment specialist, never mind a user creating interactively with a recruitment specialist one job description from another job description. In Roy, for example, the Examiner suggests that the user may be a client or a recruiter. However, both the client and the recruiter of Roy are not interactively working on a job description together. The Examiner cites Balabine only for object-oriented databases while citing Almog for formulating requirements for a job. However, like Roy, Almog's employers and workers are not interactively developing a job description. Therefore, the combination of Roy, Almog and Balabine fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because the combination of Roy, Almog and Balabine fails to teach or suggest each and every element of amended claims 1, 17 and 18, Applicant submits that claims are 1, 17 and 18 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 depend on and

incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

II. Claims 12-16 and 19-22 rejected over Roy, Danielson and Balabine

Claims 12-16 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy in view of Danielson et al. (US 6,993,723) and further in view of Balabine. Amended claims 12, 19 and 20 are independent. Claims 13-16 and 21 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 12 as amended. Claim 22 depends on and incorporates all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 20 as amended. Applicant traverses this rejection and submits that Roy, Danielson and Balabine, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims as amended.

A. Amended Independent Claims 12, 19 and 20 Patentable over Roy, Danielson and Balabine

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art references, either alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims.

Amended claims 12, 19 and 20 recite in part:

receiving, during the job description development process by the requirements specialist working interactively with the client, through another instance of the interface of the computer-based management system, real-time feedback from the client on the portion of the job description;

Applicant submits that the combination of Roy, Danielson and Balabine fails to teach or suggest at least the above feature of the claimed invention.

Neither Roy nor Danielson nor Balabine teach or suggest receiving by the requirements specialist real-time feedback from the client during a job description development process that is interactive between the client and the requirements specialist. None of these references describe an interactive process for job description development during which the client gives to the requirements specialist real-time feedback on a portion of the job description. In Roy and Almog for example, a client or a recruiter may access the system but a client is not giving real-time feedback to a recruiter during an interactive job description development process. Therefore, the combination of Roy, Danielson and Balabine fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because the combination of Roy, Danielson and Balabine fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 12, 19 and 20, Applicant submits that claims 12, 19 and 20 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 13-16 and 21 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 12. Claim 22 depends on and incorporates all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 20. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 13-16 and 21-22 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 12-16 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicant contends that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's representative would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number identified below.

Dated: November 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
/Christopher J. McKenna/

Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicant
Foley and Lardner LLP
111 Huntington Ave
Boston, MA 02199
(617) 342-4057 (phone)
(617) 342-4001 (fax)